



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,534	07/20/2001	John M. Baron	10005753-1	1977
22879	7590	01/10/2006	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			COUSO, YON JUNG	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2625	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/909,534 ✓	BARON, JOHN M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yon Couso	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1 and 3-8 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10, 12, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmermann (US Patent No. 5,185,667) in view of Koyanagi et al (US Patent No. 6,898,742).

As per claim 9, Zimmermann teaches an image orientation correction system comprising: a user-selectable input device (12 and 13 in figure 1 and column 3, lines 39-43); a tilt determining mechanism configured to sense orientation errors of received images (column 3, lines 30-39); a processor configured to respond to said user-selectable input device and to send said orientation errors of an image for modifying said image to remove said orientation errors (column 3, lines 39-43); and; a display configured to display a digital image as modified by said processor (column 3, lines 46-48 and 11 in figure 1). Even though Zimmermann does not teach details on the tilt determining mechanism configured to automatically sense orientation errors of received images, Zimmermann clearly teaches a tilt determining mechanism configured to sense orientation errors of received images (column 3, lines 30-39). Moreover, Koyanagi teaches an automatic deskew system and an automatic deskew method (column 2,

lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate automatic deskewing technique taught in Koyanagi into the tilt determining mechanism configured to sense orientation errors of received images in the Zimmermann's image orientation correction system. Zimmermann and Koyanagi are combinable because they are both from in the area of image skew correction. Not only it would have been obvious to make something automatic when there is a teaching of deskewing mechanism to configured to sense orientation errors of received images, but also Koyanagi teaches an automatic deskew system and an automatic deskew method (column 2, lines 1-4).

As per claim 10, Zimmermann teaches that the user-selectable input allows a user to disable said orientation correction system (12 and 13 in figure 1 and column 3, lines 39-43).

As per claim 12, Zimmermann teaches the tilt determining mechanism is implemented via software (column 5, line 20-column 8, line 13).

As per claim 16, Zimmermann teaches a camera comprising: an image sensor (12 and 13 in figure 1 and column 3, lines 39-43); a display connected to display an image captured by said image sensor (11 in figure 1); an orientation sensor identifying an orientation of said image sensor with respect to said image captured by said image sensor (column 3, lines 30-39); and an image processor responsive to said orientation sensor for performing a rotation operation on said image captured by said image sensor so as to provide corrected image data reducing a misalignment of said image (column

3, lines 39-43). With regard to automatically identifying an orientation of said image sensor with respect to said image captured by said image sensor, see claim 9.

As per claim 17, Zimmermann teaches a memory configured to store corrected image data (9 in figure 1).

As per claims 18, and 19, even though Zimmermann and Koyanagi do not teach details on lossy compression algorithm, compression is divided into two categories, lossy or lossless. Most of all image compression is performed based on one of lossy compression algorithm and most of all image data are compressed before storage or transmission. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate compression algorithm into digital image processing technique.

As per claim 20, Koyanagi teaches that the image captured by said image sensor is stored in said memory when said identified orientation is greater than a predetermined maximum value (claim 1, lines 1-4).

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmermann in view of Koyanagi et al as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Sharp "GP1S36 Tilt Detecting Photointerrupter" (herein called 'Sharp').

As per claim 11, Zimmermann discloses tilt determining mechanism. However, Zimmermann does not teach details on a tilt sensor. Sharp teaches a tilt sensor which can be used in digital camera or camcorder. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to incorporate tilt sensor taught in Sharp into the Zimmermann's tilt determining mechanism because Zimmermann already teaches tilt determining and correcting mechanism more or less manually. Incorporation of tilt sensor into the digital

camera taught in Zimmermann would increase the efficiency and reliability. Given the obvious benefits, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate a tilt sensor taught in Sharp into the Zimmermann's tilt determining mechanism.

4. Claims 13, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmermann in view of Koyanagi et al as in claim 9, and further in view of Tretter.

As per claim 13, even though Zimmermann does not teach details on the software implemented tilt determining mechanism that detects and uses an edge of an object contained within said digital representation of said image to determine said orientation errors of said digital image, Zimmermann discloses the tilt determining mechanism is implemented via software (column 5, line 20-column 8, line 13).
Zimmermann also teaches software implemented tilt determining mechanism that uses X-map and Y-map processor to perform two-dimensional transform mapping. Moreover, Tretter teaches the software implemented tilt determining mechanism that detects and uses an edge of an object contained within said digital representation of said image to determine said orientation errors of said digital image (figure 5 and column 6, lines 5-14). Given the references at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate tilt determining mechanism that detects and uses an edge of an object contained within said digital representation of said image to determine said orientation errors of said digital image taught in Tretter into Zimmermann which already teaches software implemented tilt determining mechanism

that uses X-map and Y-map processor to perform two-dimensional transform mapping. The motivation to combine the references is that the Zimmermann already teaches using vertical and horizontal grid lines, which corresponds to the edges in Tretter to determine and correct the orientation error.

As per claim 14, Tretter teaches an automatic disable feature which disables said orientation correction when said orientation error is determined to be greater than a predetermined maximum error value (multiple skew angle at column 7, lines 32-57).

As per claim 15, Tretter does not set the predetermined maximum error value to be five degrees. However, as can be seen in the specification page 6, lines 21-22, there is nothing critical about the angle specified. Merely setting a threshold value to a five degree does not deemed to be patentably significant.

5. Claims 1, 3-8 are allowed.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Anderson, Parulski et al, Bynum, and Murakami are also cited.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yon Couso whose telephone number is (571) 272-7448. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta, can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YJC



VON J. COUSO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

January 3, 2006